

United Nations, amendments may be proposed by a vote of two-thirds of the United Nations General Assembly and may become effective upon ratification by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. According to Article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations, a special conference of members of the United Nations may be called "for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter" and any changes proposed by the conference may "take effect when ratified by two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations including all the permanent members of the Security Council." Once an amendment to the Charter of the United Nations is adopted then that amendment "shall come into force for all Members of the United Nations," even those nations who did not ratify the amendment, just as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America is effective in all of the states, even though the legislature of a state or a convention of a state refused to ratify. Such an amendment process is totally foreign to a treaty. See *Id.*, at 575-84.

Third, the authority to enter into an agreement made in the name of the people cannot be politically or legally limited by any preexisting constitution, treaty, alliance, or instructions. An agreement made in the name of a nation, however, may not contradict the authority granted to the governing powers and, thus, is so limited. For example, the people ratified the Constitution of the United States of America notwithstanding the fact that the constitutional proposal had been made in disregard to specific instructions to amend the Articles of Confederation, not to displace them. See *Sources of Our Liberties* 399-403 (R. Perry ed.) (American Bar Foundation: 1972). As George Mason observed at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, "Legislatures have no power to ratify" a plan changing the form of government, only "the people" have such power. 4 *The Founders' Constitution*, supra, at 651.

As a direct consequence of this original power of the people to constitute a new government, the Congress under the new constitution was authorized to admit new states to join the original 13 states without submitting the admission of each state to the 13 original states. In like manner, the Charter of the United Nations, forged in the name of the "peoples" of those nations, established a new international government with independent powers to admit to membership whichever nations the United Nations governing authorities chose without submitting such admissions to each individual member nation for ratification. See Charter of the United Nations, Article 4, Section 2. No treaty could legitimately confer upon the United Nations General Assembly such powers and remain within the legal and political definition of a treaty.

By invoking the name of the "peoples of the United Nations," then, the Charter of the United Nations envisioned a new constitution creating a new civil order capable of not only imposing obligations upon the subscribing nations, but also imposing obligations directly upon the peoples of those nations. In his special contribution to the United Nations Human Development Report 2000, United Nations Secretary-General Annan made this claim crystal clear:

Even though we are an organization of Member States, the rights and ideals the United Nations exists to protect are those of the peoples. No government has the right to

hide behind national sovereignty in order to violate the human rights or fundamental freedoms of its peoples. Human Development Report 2000 31 (July 2000) [Emphasis added.]

While no previous United Nations' secretary general has been so bold, Annan's proclamation of universal jurisdiction over "human rights and fundamental freedoms" simply reflects the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations which contemplated a future in which the United Nations operates in perpetuity "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights . . . to establish conditions under which justice . . . can be maintained, and to promote social progress and between standards of life in larger freedom." Such lofty goals and objectives are comparable to those found in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America: "to . . . establish Justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the Blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity . . ."

There is, however, one difference that must not be overlooked. The Constitution of the United States of America is a legitimate constitution, having been submitted directly to the people for ratification by their representatives elected and assembled solely for the purpose of passing on the terms of that document. The Charter of the United Nations, on the other hand, is an illegitimate constitution, having only been submitted to the United States Senate for ratification as a treaty. Thus, the Charter of the United Nations, not being a treaty, cannot be made the supreme law of our land by compliance with Article II, Section 2 of Constitution of the United States of America. Therefore, the Charter of the United Nations is neither politically nor legally binding upon the United States of America or upon its people.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF COMAL COUNTY COMMISSIONER JAN KENNADY

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jan Kennady for a lifetime of dedicated public service.

Jan Kennady served on the New Braunfels City Council from 1993-1996, and as Mayor of New Braunfels from 1996-1999. Her energy and organizational skill were a tremendous boon to New Braunfels, and she was honored by the Texas State Legislature with a resolution expressing the State's appreciation.

She has also worked for years as a volunteer leader and organizer, and has been honored with multiple awards, including 1995 Citizen of the Year, the Chamber of Commerce President's Award, the Women of Distinction Award, and the 10 Outstanding Republican Women Award. In 1998, Governor Bush appointed her to a three-year term on the Texas Commission on Volunteer and Community Service. Her work on education, senior health, and other issues has earned her the thanks of a grateful community.

Jan Kennady is a model of initiative, commitment, and talent. She has made her city, her State, and her party stronger by her serv-

ice. Today, she continues to serve her fellow Texans as Comal County Commissioner. I am honored to have this opportunity to recognize Jan Kennady, and to thank her for all she has done for those people whose lives she has touched.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of Comal County Commissioner Jan Kennady.

THE UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2003

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2005

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, no child should be left to fend for herself in a complex immigration system that even you and I would fear. This is why today I am again introducing the Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act.

It is true that in 2002 Congress transferred the care, custody, and placement of unaccompanied alien children from the Department of Justice to the Department of Health and Human Services to improve the treatment children receive when encountered at our borders. This is certainly a big step in the right direction and I commend the Department of Health and Human Services for taking important steps to improve the care and custody of these vulnerable children. But these positive actions did not end the plethora of problems unaccompanied children experience when they come into contact with our immigration authorities.

Health and Human Services inherited a system that relied upon a variety of detention facilities to house children and was given little legislative direction to implement their new responsibilities. As a result, some children from repressive regimes or abusive families continue to fend for themselves in a complex legal and sometimes punitive system, without knowledge of the English language, with no adult guidance, and with no legal counsel. Some unaccompanied children are treated in a manner that our country usually reserves for criminals, not helpless victims.

The Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act would not change the ultimate decision on what happens to the quest by children for permanent safe haven in America. It would ensure that while the decision-making process is underway, children are housed in a humane and civil way and that those deciding are accurately informed about the facts of each case and the law.

Consider the compelling story of Esther, a nine-year-old victim of abuse, neglect and abandonment by her parents. She escaped to the U.S. with relatives who later turned her over to immigration authorities at the age of fourteen. Esther was detained for over six months in a juvenile jail and represented by an unscrupulous attorney who failed to appear at her immigration hearing, leaving her defenseless. The immigration judge ordered Esther to leave the United States.

Well after the Homeland Security Act transferred the care and custody of unaccompanied

alien children to Health and Human Services, the Associated Press reported on a ten-year-old boy from Ghana who "immigration officials, unsure of where the boy's parents were or how he boarded the plane without travel documents, sent him to a detention center . . . while they figured out what to do with him. Three years later, he [was] still in custody."

Another child, Malik Jarno, was detained in various adult and juvenile detention facilities for almost three years. It took several letters from over 50 members of Congress before Malik was released to a home for refugees as he continued proceedings to determine his immigration status.

It is the time to complete the positive steps we have already taken to more fully protect children who arrive in the U.S. with no parents or guardians to watch over them. The Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act will ensure minimum standards for the care and custody of unaccompanied children and require a smooth transfer of minors from the Department of Homeland Security to the Department of Health and Human Services. It will also ensure that children receive adult and legal guidance as they navigate through our complex immigration system. I urge this body to swiftly consider and pass the Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act.

IN MEMORY OF DR. DONALD
ARTHUR BROOKS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give tribute to Dr. Donald Arthur Brooks, from the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for his lifelong contributions to his community and to his fellow citizens. Dr. Brooks was the first African-American general surgeon in Ft. Worth and the first to be a board-certified surgeon in Texas. Dr. Brooks died on March 4th at the age of 83.

I would like to recognize and celebrate Dr. Brooks' life today. Dr. Brooks set high standard by which all American citizens should strive. Born into a financially disadvantaged family, Dr. Brooks proved himself as an exceptional student graduating near the top of his class. After receiving his Bachelor of Science at Prairie View A&M in 1941, he then served two years in the United States Army. Upon returning from active duty, Dr. Brooks saved his money and went back to school to receive his Medical Degree at Howard College of Medicine.

Dr. Brooks returned to Ft. Worth in 1957 to become the first African-American to practice general surgery. He and his brother worked side-by-side and quickly became among the best-known health care providers for the African-American community. Later, Dr. Brooks would be named Chief of Surgery at St. Joseph's Hospital. He continued to practice and was distinguished as a pioneer of his community.

When he retired from surgery in 1993, Dr. Brooks continued to provide medical service to the community by becoming a staff physician

at Tarrant County Jail. Dr. Brooks became the patriarch of medical dynasty which resulted in a family tree of six doctors.

It was my honor to represent Dr. Brooks. My extend sympathies to his family and friends. May the example of this "Southern Gentleman" be a lesson to us all, that our deeds should represent us well.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS
OF GUADALUPE COUNTY COM-
MISSIONER ROGER BAENZIGER

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Guadalupe County Commissioner Roger Baenziger.

Roger Baenziger is one of Guadalupe County's most loyal and accomplished native sons. He was born and raised in Seguin, attended Seguin High School and received an accounting degree from Texas Lutheran University. He returned to the community to join his father's business, Model Market, which he helped his father run for the last 30 years.

As a lifelong small businessman, Roger is uniquely aware of the importance of small business to the health of his community. He works to promote enterprise and innovation as a member of the Chamber of Commerce and the Farm Bureau, and continues to operate his own small ranch.

Roger is committed to using his position as Guadalupe County Commissioner to promote orderly growth and fiscal responsibility. As a public servant and a volunteer, he has given an enormous amount back to the community in which he was born and raised. I am proud to have this opportunity to honor his service, and to thank him for all he has done for the people of Guadalupe County.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of Guadalupe County Commissioner Roger Baenziger.

JOINT STATEMENT BY LEADERS
OF PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2005

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, budgets are moral documents, which reflect the values and priorities of our nation. Drawing from my own faith, the Catholic Bishops have stated, "The obligation to provide justice for all means that the poor have the single most urgent economic claim on the conscience of the nation." The more I hear this Administration's justification for the harsh decisions within their budget, the more I believe that there is no justification. This budget simply reflects the wrong values and priorities. That is why I would like to enter for today's RECORD a joint statement by the leaders of five mainline Protestant denominations representing over 20 million followers in

the United States. These religious leaders today called President Bush's 2006 federal budget "unjust."

The statement is signed by: the Most Reverend Frank Griswold, Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church USA, the Right Reverend Mark Hanson, Presiding Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, the Reverend Dr. Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church (USA), United Church of Christ General Minister and President John H. Thomas, and James Winkler, General Secretary of the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church.

JOINT STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, DC, Mar. 8, 2005.—We are preachers, and so, in explaining our opposition to the 2006 Federal Budget that President Bush has sent to Congress, it seems only fitting that we should begin with Scripture.

There was a rich man who was dressed in purple and fine linen and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus, covered with sores, who longed to satisfy his hunger with what fell from the rich man's table; even the dogs would come and lick his sores. The poor man died and was carried away by the angels to be with Abraham. The rich man also died and was buried. In Hades, where he was being tormented, he looked up and saw Abraham far away with Lazarus by his side. He called out, "Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am in agony in these flames."

The passage comes from 16th chapter of the Gospel according to Luke, and it contains a warning that should deeply trouble those of us who live in a wealthy nation. As the story continues, the rich man implores Abraham to raise Lazarus from the dead and send him to the house of his brothers so that they may be spared his torment.

"They have Moses and the prophets," Abraham replies. "They should listen to them." The rich man says, "No, father Abraham; but if someone goes to them from the dead, they will repent." And Abraham answers, "If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced even if someone rises from the dead."

In telling this story, Jesus makes clear that perpetrating economic injustice is among the gravest of sins. Yet self-interest is so deeply ingrained in each one of us, he says, that we will not renounce it, even should someone rise from the dead. Jesus was right about that. It was he who rose from the dead to save us from greed and myriad other sins. Yet those who have much continue feasting, even as those who have little remain at their gates.

Like many Americans, we read our daily newspaper through the lens of faith, and when we see injustice, it is our duty to say so. The 2006 Federal Budget that President Bush has sent to Capitol Hill is unjust. It has much for the rich man and little for Lazarus. According to the White House's own numbers, this budget would move 300,000 people off food stamps in the next five years. It would cut the funds that allow 300,000 children to receive day care. It would reduce funding for Medicaid by \$45 billion over the next ten years, and this at a time when 45 million Americans—the highest level on record—are already without health insurance.

These cuts would be alarming in any circumstances, but in the context of the 2006